

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/393,576

Applicant(s)

Enomoto et al

Examiner

Khanh Dinh

Group Art Unit

2155

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Khanh Dinh

(3) _____

(2) Lynne D. Anderson (Undersigned For The Applicant)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Apr 16, 2002Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: 23-28

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Clarifying the Office Action mailed on 12/17/2001 (paper #7). Manipulation functions can be interpreted as same as the magnifying functions.

The Applicant will file the Response to the Office Action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Khanh Dinh

4/16/2002

A.U. 2155

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.